REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3, and 28 have been amended, and new Claims 29-40 have been added; therefore, Claims 1-40 are pending. Applicant has carefully considered the application in view of the Examiner's action and, in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

As a preliminary matter it is noted that references herein to paragraph numbers are with respect to Patent Publication No. US 2003/0037069 A1, not the patent application as originally filed.

Claims 1 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,009,436 to Motoyama et al. (hereinafter "*Motoyama*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,403 to Bata et al. (hereinafter "*Bata*"). Claims 2-7 and 9-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Motoyama* in view of *Bata* in further view of Microsoft FrontPage 2000, Screen Shots, 12/31/99, pp. 1-20 (hereinafter "*FrontPage*"). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Motoyama* in view of *Bata*, *FrontPage*, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,898 to Leblang et al. (hereinafter "*Leblang*"). In response, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1 and 28 such that they now more clearly distinguish, and are patentable over the cited references.

Specifically, and in addition to the Remarks and Arguments set forth in the responses of March 20, 2008, January 26, 2009, and July 17, 2009, independent Claims 1 and 28 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, namely, that the steps of downloading, parsing, and storing are performed automatically by a processor and, furthermore, that it is automatically determined when each of the steps of downloading and parsing are completed, and upon a determination that the step of downloading is completed, the step of parsing is performed automatically, and upon a determination that the step of parsing is completed, the step of storing is performed automatically, that is, without human intervention. It is considered that, upon a review of the specification and drawings of the present patent application by a person having ordinary skill in the art, the review including, by way of example but not limitation, paragraphs [0105] – [0108] and [0115] – [0117], that it would be apparent that the steps of downloading,

parsing, and storing are performed as now amended, and therefore, that no new matter has been added to the application.

This distinguishing characteristic provides Applicant's invention with numerous advantages not seen in the cited references. For example, the content of web pages may be manipulated, modified, translated, censured (*e.g.*, to remove profane language), or the like without an interactive user being involved or an end user even realizing same. Content from a web page or a plurality of web pages from different web sites may be automatically aggregated or presented in summary form for an end user.

Motoyama has been cited as fully disclosing Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 1 and 28, except merely for the teaching that the markup language file containing tag names contains arbitrarily named tags and wherein the directory structure storing the markup language file contains folders, subfolders, and files, complying with the structure of the first markup language file, wherein each of the folders and subfolders depend from the tag names in the markup language file, for which *Bata* was cited. *Motoyama*, however, fails to either teach or suggest all the steps discussed above of <u>automatically</u> downloading, parsing, and storing performed by a <u>processor</u>, and performing the steps of parsing and storing <u>upon a determination by a processor that the respective preceding steps of downloading and parsing have been completed</u>, as recited by Applicant in Claims 1 and 28, as now amended. In clear contrast to Applicant, *Motoyama* does <u>not</u> perform all these steps of downloading, parsing, and storing <u>automatically</u>, but requires <u>interactive input from a user</u> for mapping a first structured information format to a second structured information format (see, *e.g.*, the Abstract, Claim 1), including "downloading ..." (col. 16, lines 1-15, "displays file name that user selects for opening", "allows user to approve" or "request") and "parsing ..." (col. 11, lines 28-32, "output from the SGML Parser 202 to be utilized as input to a Map Editor 208, along with an interactive User 210 input"). That *Motoyama* requires an interactive user is in fact pervasive throughout *Motoyama*, as seen, for example, at col. 2, lines 56-57; at col. 2, lines 66-67; at col. 3, line 1 – col. 4, line 14; at col. 22, lines 64-65; at col. 24, lines 10-12; at col. 24, lines 45-53; at col. 25, lines 14-15; at col. 25, lines 34 - col. 26, line 25; at col. 25, lines 47-48; at col. 27, lines 43 – col.

29, line 3; and in Claims 1(c), 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20(h), 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42, 43, 44, and 45. Moreover, none of the prior art references cures this deficiency of *Motoyama*.

It is argued in section 9 of the Office action that *Motoyama* teaches a <u>processor</u> for execution of computer code. However, the computer code that the processor of *Motoyama* executes is for "SGML to HTML mapping and transformation" including steps of parsing and presenting (col. 26, line 66 – col. 27, line 24). *Motoyama* fails to teach the steps discussed above of (1) <u>automatically</u> downloading, (2) automatically determining when downloading is complete, (3) automatically parsing upon completion of downloading, (4) automatically determining when parsing is complete, and (5) automatically storing upon completion of parsing, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 28 as now amended. While in *Bata* "data are dynamically transformed" and "database data may be automatically formatted", *Bata* fails to cure the five identified deficiencies of *Motoyama*.

Further to section 9, col. 2, lines 42-49, of *Motoyama* is cited for teaching automatic processing of a markup language. However, *Motoyama* at best teaches the automation of parsing and storing, but not of downloading, because it requires an interactive user to initiate the step of downloading. Further, this deficiency of *Motoyama* is not cured by any of the other prior art references.

Still further to section 9, paragraph [0063] of Applicant's application is cited for teaching that Applicant's own invention "appears to require" user interaction ("data request from a user … human being … computer process controlled by a human being … automated computer process"). In response, Applicant respectfully points out that paragraph [0063] says, with emphasis added, that "The user <u>may</u> be a human being, <u>or</u> the user <u>may</u> be a computer process controlled by a human being, <u>or the user may be an automated computer process</u>." While Applicant's invention allows for user interaction, or for a user to be a human being, it is in the alternative and is <u>not required</u>, and, in fact, the "user" may be an <u>automated computer process</u>.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that none of the cited references, either singularly or in any combination, teach, suggest, or render obvious the unique combination now recited in independent Claims 1 and 28. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 1 clearly and precisely distinguishes over the cited combinations of references in a patentable sense, and is

therefore allowable over those references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Motoyama* in view of *Bata* be withdrawn.

Claims 2-27 depend from and further limit independent Claim 1, in a patentable sense, and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, are also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of dependent Claims 2-27 be withdrawn, as well.

New Claims 29-40 depend from independent Claims 1 and 28 and recite where the URL is located or read from. Support for new Claims 29-40 is identified in the following table, thereby adding no new matter to the application as originally filed. Claims 29-40, furthermore, depend from and further limit independent Claims 1 and 28, in a patentable sense, and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, are also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims	URL	Support (paragraphs, figures)
29, 35	read from a browser via a CGI transaction	65, 66, 73-75, 86, 90, 93, 147, 168, 169
30, 36	read from a database	165, 166, Fig. 15
31, 37	embedded in computer program code	106-109, 140
32, 38	in an environment variable	Would be apparent to a person skilled in the art upon a review of the application
33, 39	in a local variable	
34, 40	in a global variable	

Applicant hereby requests, under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), a three-month extension of time in the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application to an Office Action, having a mailing date of September 28, 2009. Payment of the small entity fees required under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is being made with the filing of this paper. Further, the addition of Claims 29-40 results in twelve additional claims in excess of twenty claims, for which fees required under 37 CFR 1.16(i) are being paid with the filing of this paper. Still further, included herewith is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), for which fees required under 37 CFR 1.17(e) are being paid with the filing of this paper. Applicant does not believe any other fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper; however, in the event that such payment is absent,

insufficient, or unacceptable, or any other fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper, to Deposit Account No. 50-2032 of Scheef & Stone, L.L.P.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this application in condition for allowance, or in better condition for appeal. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests, for the reasons set forth herein and for other reasons clearly apparent, full allowance of Claims 1-40 so that the application may be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions or desire clarification of any sort, or deem that any further amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.

/Jack D. Stone, Jr./

_____

Jack D. Stone, Jr.
Reg. No. 38,324

500 N. Akard Street, Suite 2700
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 706-4207
Fax: (214) 706-4242
jack.stone@scheefandstone.com